

CHARLES A. MICHALEK, ESQ.

Nevada Bar No. 5721

ROGERS, MASTRANGELO, CARVALHO & MITCHELL

700 South Third Street

Las Vegas, Nevada 89101

Phone: (702) 383-3400

Email: cmichalek@rmcmlaw.com

Lawrence S. Gosewisch (admitted *pro hac vice*)

Brian T. Maye (admitted *pro hac vice*)

Matthew D. Martin (admitted *pro hac vice*)

ADLER MURPHY & McQUILLEN LLP

20 South Clark Street, Suite 2500

Chicago, Illinois 60603

Phone: (312) 345-0700

Email: lgosewisch@amm-law.com

bmaye@amm-law.com

mmartin@amm-law.com

Attorneys for Defendants Frontier Airlines, Inc.,

Scott Warren, and Rex Shupe

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

PETER DELVECCHIA, individually and as
next friend of A.D., a Minor,

Plaintiffs,

v.

FRONTIER AIRLINES, INC.,
SCOTT WARREN, and REX SHUPE,

Defendants.

Case No.: 2:19-cv-01322-KJD-DJA

**FRONTIER'S REPLY BRIEF IN
SUPPORT OF ITS MOTION TO SEAL
EXHIBITS A AND A-1 TO ITS
RESPONSE TO PLAINTIFFS' FIFTH
MOTION TO COMPEL**

**DEFENDANT FRONTIER AIRLINES, INC.'s
REPLY IN SUPPORT OF ITS MOTION TO SEAL EXHIBITS A AND A-1
TO ITS RESPONSE TO PLAINTIFFS' FIFTH MOTION TO COMPEL**

1 Defendant Frontier Airlines, Inc., (“Frontier”), by its undersigned counsel, hereby files this Reply
2 in Support of its Motion to Seal, requesting an Order sealing the documents contained in Exhibits A and
3 A-1 to its Response to Plaintiffs’ Fifth Motion to Compel.
4

5 **Introduction**

6 This case is about Plaintiffs’ claim that an “entire team of flight attendants” and two pilots
7 conspired to falsely accuse Peter DelVecchia of inappropriately touching A.D. “based solely on their
8 appearance as a White father with a Black son.” ECF 177, p. 11. Acknowledging that Frontier’s “entire
9 team of flight attendants” was itself comprised of Black and White crewmembers, Plaintiffs note they will
10 be “presenting testimony from an eminent sociologist in their case in chief that Caucasians do not hold a
11 monopoly in the field of race discrimination, especially where transracial adoption is concerned.” *Id.* at
12 note 6.
13

14 Plaintiffs will have their day to present their theories and expert witnesses, but, in the meantime,
15 their pursuit of irrelevant and overly burdensome discovery has mired Frontier in a rut of endless discovery
16 disputes that have no connection whatsoever to transracial adoptions or any of the issues in the case.
17 Rather than attempting to prove that Frontier’s Black and White crewmembers acted purely out of racial
18 animus toward a White man travelling with his Black son, Plaintiffs are attempting to turn this case into a
19 referendum on how Frontier responded to hundreds of unrelated passenger complaints.
20

21 In their Fourth and Fifth Motions to Compel, Plaintiffs argue they are entitled to contact other
22 Frontier passengers who complained of racial discrimination to show “a pattern by Frontier of sweeping
23 legitimate discrimination complaints under the rug.” ECF 164, p. 15. Plaintiffs also seek additional
24 discovery regarding Frontier’s investigations into the unrelated complaints to show Frontier’s alleged
25 policy of “restrict[ing] investigations of race discrimination complaints” and “dissuading complainants
26
27
28

1 States.” ECF 84, p. 4. Contrary to Plaintiffs’ arguments, Frontier complied with the Court’s Order by
2 producing copies of the actual discrimination complaints with redactions for sensitive and personal contact
3 information. See ECF 150, p. 6 (this Court held, “Plaintiffs point to no language of the Court’s order that
4 Frontier has violated, and the Court’s order did not entitle Plaintiffs to this information”).

5
6 In granting Frontier’s motions for protective orders to seal the redacted copies of prior passenger
7 complaints, the Court ruled that the documents related to discovery motions (Plaintiffs’ motions for
8 sanctions) that were “neither dispositive nor tangentially related to the underlying cause of action.” ECF
9 150, p. 8. The Court applied the “good cause” standard and held, “[w]hether complaints and reports of
10 discrimination and trafficking are confidential has little to do with Plaintiffs’ claims.” *Id.* The Court also
11 ruled there were “compelling reasons” to keep the records sealed because the passengers and employees
12 quoted in the records believed they were communicating in a private forum and did consent to releasing
13 the information. *Id.* at 9.

14
15 The Court’s reasoning in its prior ruling applies equally here. The deposition transcript contained
16 in Exhibit A includes questions by Plaintiffs’ counsel focused exclusively on the confidential customer
17 complaints contained in Exhibit A-1. As reflected in the email exchange attached to Plaintiffs’ Response
18 to Frontier’s Motion to Seal, Frontier explained as much to Plaintiffs’ counsel in hopes that counsel would
19 agree to what Frontier perceived to be a routine request. See ECF 178-1, pp. 13, 17, 25. Regrettably, the
20 email exchange deteriorated to the point that Plaintiffs’ counsel claimed Frontier failed to adequately
21 support its position vis-à-vis sealing the deposition transcript, requested that Frontier share its Response
22 brief in an unfinished and unfiled form, and vaguely and baselessly accused Frontier of making an “unfair
23 swipe at his character and professionalism.” *Id.* at 27. Unable to agree on holding even a simple meet-
24 and-confer, Frontier determined any further discussions with Plaintiffs’ counsel would not be fruitful and
25 filed the instant Motion to Seal with the understanding that it would be contested.
26
27
28

1 **1. Good Cause**

2 The deposition transcript and customer complaints contained in Exhibits A and A-1 are, at most,
3 only tangentially related to Plaintiffs' underlying claim under 42 U.S.C. § 1981. A successful § 1981 claim
4 requires proof of intentional and purposeful discrimination, and a showing that the plaintiff would not
5 have been deprived of a legally protected right but for the plaintiff's race. *Comcast Corp. v. National*
6 *Ass'n of African American-Owned Media*, __ U.S. __, __, 140 S. Ct. 1009, 1019 (2020); *General Building*
7 *Contractors Ass'n v. Pennsylvania*, 458 U.S. 375, 389 (1982).

9 In this case, Plaintiffs claim Frontier's crewmembers would not have reported any concerns about
10 inappropriate touching but for the fact that Peter DelVecchia is White, and A.D. is Black. However, the
11 questions asked during Ms. Zimmerman's deposition (as well as those asked during the depositions of
12 other Frontier customer service employees) have no relevant connections to Plaintiffs' claim that the
13 crewmembers aboard the subject flight discriminated against them based solely on their racial animus
14 toward "transracial adoptions." It is a stretch to say that Exhibits A and A-1 are even tangentially related
15 to the underlying claims, and the "good cause" standard undoubtedly applies.

17 Plaintiffs state they do not object to sealing the portions of Ms. Zimmerman's testimony that
18 "specifically discussed the contents" of the already sealed customer complaints, but they do object to
19 sealing everything else, arguing that good cause "does not exist to seal transcripts of normal deposition
20 testimony." ECF 178, p. 2. Frontier submits that Ms. Zimmerman's deposition testimony is anything but
21 "normal." The transcript reflects sensitive personal and commercial information that should not be made
22 publicly available after Frontier cooperated with Plaintiffs and presented five employees who testified at
23 length regarding controversial topics that are wholly unrelated to the issues in this case.

25 Frontier is limited in what it can say about Ms. Zimmerman's deposition transcript but submits
26 that nothing in this litigation warrants making Exhibits A and A-1 available to the public. As the Court
27
28

1 can see, the first 25 pages are taken from a condensed version of the deposition transcript. The first several
2 pages include questions by Plaintiffs' counsel about certain systems and procedures used by Frontier's
3 customer service department to track and respond to customer complainants. Counsel's insinuation is that
4 Frontier uses certain stock phrases in responding to different types of passenger complaints without first
5 meeting Plaintiffs' standards for conducting adequate investigations. See Ex. A, pp. 83-87. Counsel later
6 questions Ms. Zimmerman about the specific allegations in the customer complaints included as Exhibit
7 A-1. See, e.g., Ex. A, pp. 103-116; 118-119; 122-123; 127-129; 134-139; 142-150; 154-156; 166. The
8 transcript also includes some lines of questioning wherein Plaintiffs' counsel makes incendiary allegations
9 about Frontier's responses to the complaints. See, e.g., Ex. A, pp. 120:19-22; 138.

10
11 Because Plaintiffs' Fourth and Fifth Motions to Compel are not dispositive, and because Ms.
12 Zimmerman's deposition transcript is (at best) only tangentially related to the merits of Plaintiffs'
13 underlying claim, the Court should rule that good cause exists to seal Exhibits A and A-1. As demonstrated
14 by the inflammatory nature of Ms. Zimmerman's deposition testimony, good cause exists to seal the
15 records under FRCP 26(c), due to the need to protect Frontier and its employee from further annoyance,
16 embarrassment, oppression, or undue burden or expense.

17 **2. Compelling Reasons**

18
19 Even if the Court were to apply the heightened standard for sealing records attached to dispositive
20 motions, the Court should still rule that compelling reasons exist to seal the disputed records. As the Court
21 ruled previously, Exhibit A-1 contains comments made by passengers and Frontier employees who
22 believed they were communicating in a private forum, and they have not consented to releasing the
23 information. See ECF 150, p. 9. Frontier also has legitimate and significant concerns that the disputed
24 deposition transcript (Ex. A) could become a vehicle for improper purposes such as promoting public
25 scandal, circulating libelous statements, or releasing trade secrets. See *Kamakana*, 447 F.3d at 1179.
26
27
28

1 “Where the material includes information about proprietary business operations, a company’s
2 business model or agreements with clients, there are compelling reasons to seal the material because
3 possible infringement of trade secrets outweighs the general public interest in understanding the judicial
4 process.” *Selling Source, LLC v. Red River Ventures, LLC*, No. 2:09-cv-01491-JCM-GWF, at *18 (D.
5 Nev. Apr. 29, 2011). Here, the disputed portion of Ms. Zimmerman’s deposition transcript and the
6 corresponding customer complaints contain sensitive information regarding Frontier’s proprietary
7 business operations and internal policies for working with customers to resolve their complaints. See *Snap*
8 *Lock Industries v. Swisstrax Corp.*, No. 2:17-cv-02742-RFB-BNW, at *3-4 (D. Nev. July 21, 2021)
9 (holding the pages from a deposition transcript contained “commercially sensitive information that could
10 hurt [the defendant’s] competitive standing unless they are sealed”). Given that none of this has anything
11 to do with an alleged racial animus for a child’s “transracial adoption,” ordering Frontier to publicly file
12 the materials would only subject Frontier to unjust exposure and risk.

15 **3. The Parties’ Protective Order**

16 Plaintiffs’ counsel avers that Ms. Zimmerman’s deposition transcript was not designated as
17 “Confidential” under the parties’ Agreed Protective Order (ECF 178-1, p. 2). However, the first paragraph
18 of the Agreed Protective Order states:
19

20 All written materials produced or disclosed by the parties in this litigation (including but
21 not limited to documents, answers to interrogatories, responses to requests for admission,
22 and deposition testimony) which a party believes, in good faith, contain sensitive security
23 information, personal health information, trade secrets, proprietary information, research,
24 technical, commercial, or financial information, or other confidential material (including
without limitation, the identity of Plaintiff A.D., a Minor), shall be designated as
confidential by affixing a label to all pages of the document with the legend
CONFIDENTIAL - SUBJECT TO PROTECTIVE ORDER.” ECF 37, ¶1.

25 Frontier submits that the portion of Ms. Zimmerman’s transcript seen in Exhibit A is deposition
26 testimony which Frontier believes, in good faith, contains “sensitive security information, personal health
27
28

information, trade secrets, proprietary information, research, technical, commercial, or financial information, or **other confidential material.**” (Emphasis added). Frontier was therefore justified in marking the transcript with the legend CONFIDENTIAL - SUBJECT TO PROTECTIVE ORDER.

4. Alternative Relief

Plaintiffs have suggested that Frontier’s motion be denied without prejudice and with leave to refile, indicating a willingness to participate in a meet-and-confer conference to discuss whether good cause exists for filing any deposition testimony under seal if it does not discuss the contents of documents that are already sealed. Frontier is of course open to continuing its efforts to resolve the issue with Plaintiffs’ counsel, though reaching an agreement as to what needs to be redacted from Ms. Zimmerman’s deposition transcript seems unlikely based on Plaintiffs’ counsel’s seven-page declaration and the attached emails. Frontier will not speak to Plaintiffs’ counsel’s commentary in his declaration other than to say that the emails speak for themselves. Finally, Plaintiffs are correct that in the past, the parties have agreed to waive the service requirements of LR IC 4-1(c). However, in this instance, given the parties’ unproductive correspondence, Frontier chose to follow the procedure set for in LR IC 4-1(c) and mail paper copies to the addresses of Plaintiffs’ counsel listed on the certificate of service. See ECF 175, p. 5-6.

Conclusion

The public benefit to accessing Exhibits A and A-1 is outweighed by Frontier’s legitimate business reasons for wanting to keep the records under seal. Frontier respectfully submits that good cause and compelling reasons exist that support maintaining Exhibits A and A-1 under seal.

DATED this 3rd day of June, 2022

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Matthew D. Martin

Lawrence S. Gosewisch (admitted *pro hac vice*)

Brian T. Maye (admitted *pro hac vice*)

Matthew D. Martin (admitted *pro hac vice*)

ADLER MURPHY & McQUILLEN LLP
20 South Clark Street, Suite 2500
Chicago, Illinois 60603
Phone: (312) 345-0700
Email: lgosewisch@amm-law.com
bmaye@amm-law.com
mmartin@amm-law.com

Charles A. Michalek (Nevada Bar No. 5721)
ROGERS, MASTRANGELO, CARVALHO &
MITCHELL
700 South Third Street
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
Phone: (702) 383-3400
Email: cmichalek@rmcmlaw.com

*Attorneys for Defendants Frontier Airlines, Inc.,
Scott Warren & Rex Shupe*

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on June 3, 2022, I caused the foregoing to be electronically filed with the United States District Court for the District of Nevada using the CM/ECF system.

John D. McKay
PARK AVENUE LAW LLC
127 West Fairbanks Avenue, Suite 519
Winter Park, Florida 32789
Phone: (800) 391-3654
Email: johndmckayatty@gmail.com

Timothy R. Titolo
TITOLO LAW OFFICE
9950 West Cheyenne Avenue
Las Vegas, Nevada 89129
Phone: (702) 869-5100
Email: tim@titololaw.com

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

By: /s/ Matthew D. Martin